

Discussion of *“Macroeconomic and Financial Risks: A Tale of Mean and Volatility”*
by Dario Caldara, Chiara Scotti and Molin Zhong

Daniilo Leiva-León

Banco de España and European Central Bank

June 12, 2023

12th European Central Bank Conference on Forecasting
Techniques


The opinions expressed in this presentation do not necessarily reflect the views of the Banco de España or the European Central Bank.

Overview

- **Goal:** Assessing drivers of uncertainty and tail risk of future GDP growth
- **Ingredients:**
 - ① BVAR with stochastic volatility and feedback with level - Mumtaz (2018)
 - ② Structural shocks - identification based on sign, exclusion and magnitude restrictions
 - ③ Effect of shocks on tails risks – “Shortfall” and “Longrise” – and uncertainty
- **Results:** Adverse (macro or financial) shocks lead to stronger effect in the left tail (shortfall) than in the right tail (longrise)
 - Timing of macro and financial effects are different

Key Result


THE RESPONSE OF UNCERTAINTY AND TAIL RISK TO SHOCKS



NOTE: The figure plots the responses of GDP growth and spread uncertainty and tail risk to a one standard deviation adverse macro (top row) and financial shock (bottom row) conditioning on 2008:Q4 data and volatility. GDP growth uncertainty and tail risk are computed from conditional densities of annualized average GDP growth between horizon 1 and f , where f denotes the forecast horizon.

Key Result


THE RESPONSE OF UNCERTAINTY AND TAIL RISK TO SHOCKS



NOTE: The figure plots the responses of GDP growth and spread uncertainty and tail risk to a one standard deviation adverse macro (top row) and financial shock (bottom row) conditioning on 2008:Q4 data and volatility. GDP growth uncertainty and tail risk are computed from conditional densities of annualized **average** GDP growth between horizon 1 and f , where f denotes the forecast horizon.



Effect of Shocks on Tail Risk

Figure: Predictive densities based on simulated data






Effect of Shocks on Tail Risk

Figure: Predictive densities based on simulated data







Effect of Shocks on Tail Risk

Figure: Predictive densities based on simulated data







Effect of Shocks on Tail Risk

Figure: Predictive densities based on simulated data



Effect of Shocks on Tail Risk





Figure: Predictive densities based on simulated data



Remark 1: Where do asymmetries come from?

- What if we shutdown the level-volatility feedback?
 - SV-BVAR on GDP and spreads up to 2008:Q4


Figure: Predictive densities based on Carriero et al. (2022)



Remark 1: Where do asymmetries come from?

- What if we shutdown the level-volatility feedback?
 - SV-BVAR on GDP and spreads up to 2008:Q4


Figure: Predictive densities based on Carriero et al. (2022)



Remark 1: Where do asymmetries come from?

- What if we shutdown the level-volatility feedback?
 - SV-BVAR on GDP and spreads up to 2008:Q4


Figure: Predictive densities based on Carriero et al. (2022)



Remark 1: Where do asymmetries come from?

- What if we shutdown the level-volatility feedback?
 - SV-BVAR on GDP and spreads up to 2008:Q4

Figure: Predictive densities based on Carriero et al. (2022)



- Level-volatility feedback is crucial to general asymmetric tail risks... but also is the aggregating procedure

Remark 2: Evaluation Performance

- The model is evaluated in sample, that is, conditional on volatility and parameters inferred with the full sample

$$p(z_{t+1:t+f} | z^t) = \int_{\Theta} \int_{H_t} \left[\int_{H_{t+1:t+f}} p(z_{t+1:t+f}, H_{t+1:t+f} | z^t, H_t, \Theta) dH_{t+1:t+f} \right] p(H_t | z^T, \Theta) p(\Theta | z^T) dH_t d\Theta$$

- However, an out of sample (real-time) forecasting evaluation is crucial for policy makers to accurately infer risks


$$p(z_{t+1:t+f} | z^t) = \int_{\Theta} \int_{H_t} \left[\int_{H_{t+1:t+f}} p(z_{t+1:t+f}, H_{t+1:t+f} | z^t, H_t, \Theta) dH_{t+1:t+f} \right] p(H_t | z^t, \Theta) p(\Theta | z^t) dH_t d\Theta$$

for $t = [\tau : T]$

Remark 3: What about COVID?

- The model produces reasonable revisions of GDP growth volatility once incorporating the COVID period
- In light of recent turbulence in financial markets, updated estimates might be of good use for policy makers

Figure: Estimates of GDP growth volatility based on Mumtaz (2018)



Other Remarks

- Macro (Financial) shocks affect at shorter (longer) horizons
⇒ Induced by persistence in data or identifying restrictions?
- Macroeconomic and financial shocks lead to an increase in uncertainty ⇒ How mechanical is that effect?
- The effects of shocks are stronger in periods of high volatility
⇒ changes in transmission mechanism, shocks size or both?
- Would tail risk measures improve performance if based on reduced form rather than structural shocks?
- **Super interesting paper! and especially very useful for policy makers**